

REMARKS

The Office Action dated May 16, 2005, has been received and carefully noted. The following remarks are submitted as a full and complete response thereto.

Claims 9-13 are pending in the present application. Claim 9 is respectfully submitted for reconsideration.

Allowed Claims

As a preliminary matter, Applicant appreciates the allowance of claims 10-13.

Claim 9 Rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph

Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement. In making the rejection, the Office Action once again took the position that the subject matter of “the plurality of word lines and the sense amp group in each of the plurality of memory cell blocks are activated” is not supported in the specification. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

The Office Action appears to be drawing a distinction between the claimed limitation of “each of the plurality of memory cell blocks are activated” versus “activating one of the plurality of word lines in the first memory cell block” as disclosed in the specification.

It is respectfully submitted that the specification does indeed fully support the claimed subject matter at issue. In particular, Applicant respectfully highlights page 12, lines 10-30 of the present specification as fully supporting the limitation of “the plurality of word lines and the sense amp group in each of the plurality of memory cell blocks are activated.” For instance, page 12, lines 5-30 discloses,

a method for conducting a multiple word line selection test on a semiconductor memory device provided with a plurality of memory cell blocks, which include a first memory cell block and a second memory cell block. Each of the memory cell blocks has a plurality of memory cells and a plurality of word lines connected to the memory cells. A plurality of sense amp groups are connected to the first and second memory cell blocks. Each of the sense amp groups amplifies cell information read from the plurality of memory cells of an associated one of the memory cell blocks. The method includes a first step for activating one of the plurality of word lines in the first memory cell block and activating the sense amp group associated with the first memory cell block after a predetermined time, a second step for activating word lines other than the one that has been activated in the first memory cell block, a third step for activating one of the plurality of word lines in the second memory cell block and activating the sense amp group associated with the second memory cell block after a predetermined time, and a fourth step for activating word lines other than the one that has been activated in the second memory cell block.

It is respectfully submitted that the combination of step one through step four provides support for the subject matter of “the plurality of word lines and the sense amp group in each of the plurality of memory cell blocks are activated.”

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

Claim 9 Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Lee et al. (US Patent No. 5,732,029, hereinafter “Lee”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection and submits that claim 9 recites subject matter that is neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited prior art.

Claim 9 recites a method for conducting a multiple word line selection test comprising, among other features, a first step for inactivating multiple word lines in the first memory cell block and the sense amp group associated with the first memory cell

block, and a second step for inactivating multiple word lines in the second memory cell block and the sense amp group associated with the second memory cell block after performing the first step.

It is respectfully submitted that the prior art fails to disclose or suggest at least the above-mentioned features of the Applicant's invention.

Lee merely discloses disabling a word line and a column selection line of a normal memory cell array (first array) in the redundancy cell test and enabling a word line and a column selection line of a redundancy memory cell array (second array). In other words, Lee merely discloses alternately disabling and enabling the first and second arrays.

In contrast, the present invention provides that when both the first and second arrays are in an activated state, multiple word lines in a first array (first memory cell block) are inactivated, and after the first array is inactivated, multiple word lines in a second array (second memory cell block) are inactivated. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the claimed invention is distinguished over Lee.

In view of the above, Applicant submits that Lee fails to disclose each and every element recited in claim 9 of the present application.

Moreover, to qualify as prior art under 35 U.S.C. §102, a single prior art reference must teach, i.e., identically describe, each feature of a rejected claim. As explained above, Lee fails to disclose or suggest each and every feature of claim 9. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 9 is not anticipated by Lee. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 9 is allowable.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

Conclusion

Given the above remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that each of claim 9 recites subject matter that is neither disclosed nor suggested in the cited prior art. Applicant also submits that the subject matter is more than sufficient to render the claims non-obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, and therefore respectfully request that claim 9 also be found allowable and that this application be passed to issue, along with allowed claims 10-13.

If for any reason, the Examiner determines that the application is not now in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact the Applicant's undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this application.

In the event this paper has not been timely filed, the Applicant respectfully petitions for an appropriate extension of time.

Any fees for such an extension, together with any additional fees that may be due with respect to this paper, may be charged to counsel's Deposit Account No. 01-2300, referring to client-matter number 108075-00124.

Respectfully submitted,



Sam Huang
Registration No. 48,430

Customer No. 004372
ARENT FOX, PLLC
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20036-5339
Tel: (202) 857-6000
Fax: (202) 857-6395

SH:ksm